

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 12, and 26 are independent.

Consideration of Document Listed on Returned IDS Form

The Information Disclosure Statement Form PTO/SB/08B returned as an attachment to the Office Action does not contain any indication as to whether the following document:

International Search Report, mailed May 21, 2003, for PCT International Application No. PCT/IL03/00040, filed January 15, 2003.

was considered or not.

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of this document and return of a copy of the Information Disclosure Statement Form PTO/SB/08B with initials next to the listing of this document to indicate such consideration.

Applicant notes this document may have possibly been submitted to the USPTO with the front page of International Publication Number WO 03/071705 A1 as a cover sheet.

Rejections

Claims 1-2, 12-13, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,792,031 B1 to Sriram et al. ("Sriram").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Independent claims 1, 12, and 26 recite interrupts having a rate of generation per unit time independent of a rate of a transfer of information per unit time.

The Office Action states on page 3:

* * * Sriram discloses a Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) rake receiver which includes an interrupt generator (col. 2, lines 45-56). The interrupt generator generates task based interrupts which generates interrupts mainly in response to data transfer (col. 6, lines 57-67). Because the interrupts are generated by data tasks and not the data the interrupt rate is independent of the data transfer rate.

Applicant respectfully requests clarification of this rejection. If interrupts are generated "mainly *in response to data transfer*", then the generation of such interrupts is necessarily

dependent on data transfer. How then can the rate of generation of such interrupts not be dependent on the rate of data transfer?

Applicant also respectfully maintains that the interpretation of Sriram as stated in the Office Action is contradicted by the actual teachings of Sriram.

Sriram explicitly taught in column 6 at lines 58-61:

Interrupt Generator 214 generates three types of interrupts including task-based interrupts, system interrupts and error interrupts. Each CCP 200 task can generate at least one interrupt.

Sriram also explicitly taught, for example, in column 4 at lines 42-44:

All timing in the coprocessor (CCP) 200 is relative to the GCC 100 count value * * *. (emphasis added)

and in column 6 at lines 47-49:

All timing in the CCP 200 is relative to the GCC 100 count value * * *. (emphasis added)

Sriram explicitly taught in column 4 at lines 29-31:

Specifically the GCC 100 counts the samples of the CDMA signal ("chips") as they arrive at the receiver * * *.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that *all* timing in CCP 200 is dependent on data transfer rate. Because interrupt generator 214 as illustrated in Figure 2 of Sriram forms a part of CCP 200, Applicant respectfully submits the rate of interrupt generation by interrupt generator 214 is necessarily dependent on data transfer rate.

The Office Action also states on page 2:

Further, it is not that the applicants claims require that the interrupts are generated *only* in response to transfer of information independent of the rate of transfer. The preamble term comprising only requires that the reference shows that interrupts are generation independent of the data rate, which as stated, is shown in [the rejection of] claim 1.

As explained above, however, Applicant respectfully submits Sriram did not teach that the rate of interrupt generation by interrupt generator 214 is independent of data transfer rate.

Noting claims 2 and 13 depend from independent claim 1 or 12, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of claims. For example, there may be additional reasons why the dependent claims are patentable.

It is respectfully submitted this patent application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2005

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/

Matthew C. Fagan
Registration No. 37,542
Telephone: (512) 732-3936
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, L.L.P.
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Telephone: (310) 207-3800